

**A25-0882**  
**STATE OF MINNESOTA**  
**IN COURT OF APPEALS**

---

In re Matthew David Guertin,

Petitioner

v.

State of Minnesota,

Respondent.

District Court Case: 27-CR-23-1886  
 Court Order Date: April 29, 2025

**ADDENDUM**  
**VOLUME I of XVI**  
**ADD. 1 - ADD. 32**

Judge: Hon. Sarah Hudleston

---

<u>Contents</u>	<u>Page</u>
<b><u>April 29, 2025 - Order for Competency to Proceed Rule 20.01,</u></b>	
Index 187.....	Add. 1-3
<b><u>April 29, 2025 - Order Appointing Forensic Navigator,</u></b>	
Index 188.....	Add. 4-5
<b><u>April 29, 2025 - Hearing Transcript re Rule 20 &amp; Self-Representation,</u></b>	
Index 189.....	Add. 6-25
<b><u>January 24, 2023 - Criminal Complaint &amp; Detention Order,</u></b>	
Index 1.....	Add. 26-32

State of Minnesota  
Hennepin County

District Court  
Fourth Judicial District

State of Minnesota,  
Plaintiff,

v.

MATTHEW DAVID GUERTIN,  
Defendant.

Order to Fourth Judicial District Court  
Psychological Services

27-CR-23-1886

Defendant Information	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Out of Custody <input type="checkbox"/> In Custody – at Facility: _____	
Date of Birth: 07/17/1981	SILS Identifier: 403932
Phone:	Home: 763-221-4540, Cell: 763-221-4540
Email:	mattguertin@protonmail.com
Current Address:	4385 Trenton Lane N UNIT 202 Plymouth MN 55442 <input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed address with Defendant
Additional family/collateral contact number and instructions:	

It is found and ordered:

- Probable cause has been found (all Rule 20.01 evaluations).
- The defendant is to be released upon completion of the interview process (A Conditional Release Order must be filed giving that direction).
- This is part of the Expedited Misdemeanor Competence Evaluation (EMCE) Program.
- For non-targeted misdemeanor<sup>1</sup> cases, a competency evaluation is in the public interest because the evaluation is necessary to assess:
  - whether the defendant has a cognitive impairment or mental illness;
  - whether the defendant has the ability to access housing, food, income, disability verification, medications, and treatment for medical conditions; or
  - whether the defendant has the ability to otherwise address any basic needs.

1. The Chief of Psychological Services of the Fourth Judicial District or the Chief's designee ("Examiner") shall conduct the following psychological evaluation, assessment and/or consultation regarding the defendant:
  - Competency to participate in proceedings pursuant to Minnesota Statutes § 611.43 and Rule 20.01
    - No new evaluation is needed based on parties' agreement to adopt the report from \_\_\_\_\_ County completed in court file number \_\_\_\_\_.  
(Cases to be set on the Rule 20 Calendar at least 2 business days out for in-custody defendants and at least 1 week for out-of-custody defendants.)
    - Mental state at the time of the alleged act pursuant to Rule 20.02 (M'Naghten Rule)
    - Sex Offender Evaluation (psychosexual) pursuant to Minnesota Statute § 609.3457, subd. 1

<sup>1</sup>Targeted Misdemeanors are:

DWI (169A.20); OFP Violation (518B.01); Assault 5 (609.224); Domestic Assault (609.2242); Interference with Privacy (609.746)  
HRO Violation (609.748); Indecent Exposure (617.23); DANCO Violation (629.75)

- Repeat Sex Offender Evaluation pursuant to Minnesota Statute § 609.3457, subd. 1a.
- Consultation (Pre-Sentence) \_\_\_\_\_
- Other (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_

2. Copies of this evaluation shall be provided to the Court and the following individuals:

Defense Attorney: RAISSA CARPENTER Phone: 612-614-0748

Prosecuting Attorney: MAWERDI AHMED HAMID Phone: 612-348-7727

Probation Officer: Phone:

3. The hearing for the return of the psychological evaluation will be held on July 15, 2025, at 9:00am.

4. Upon presentation of this order, the relevant custodian of records shall provide (whether mailed, discussed verbally, faxed, or personally delivered) to the Examiner all relevant records from the following sources: behavioral, chemical dependency, developmental disability, educational, employment, judicial, law enforcement (including audio/visual recordings), medical, probation/correction, psychological, and social service. A copy of the records so requested shall be delivered to the Examiner within 96 hours of presentation of this order. Records that are faxed shall be sent to 612-843-9315. Mailed records should be sent to Hennepin County District Court, Psychological Services, 300 South Sixth Street, C-509 Government Center, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55487. All agencies maintaining the above-listed records may also communicate verbally with the requesting Examiner.

- **The Court specifically finds** good cause exists for authorizing the disclosure of the identified records, including chemical dependency records, because other ways of obtaining the information are not available or would not be effective, and the public interest and need for disclosure outweighs the potential injury to the patient, the physician/patient relationship and any chemical dependency treatment facility or organization holding records pertaining to Defendant.

The Court hereby attests pursuant to HIPAA Privacy Rule at 45 CFR 164.502(a)(5)(iii), the purpose of the use or disclosure of the requested protected health information is **not** to investigate or impose liability on any person for the mere act of seeking, obtaining, providing, or facilitating reproductive health care or to identify any person for such purposes. If a person knowingly and in violation of HIPAA obtains individually identifiable health information relating to an individual or discloses individually identifiable health information to another person, that person may be subject to criminal penalties pursuant to [42 U.S.C. 1320d-6](#).

5. During the preparation of the report, the Examiner and any employee of Community Corrections and Rehabilitation may discuss the case and share relevant information in a manner consistent with Minnesota Rules of Criminal Procedure, Minnesota Statutes, and case law.
6. If a sex offender evaluation has been ordered and the defendant is a Repeat Sex Offender as defined in Minnesota Statute § 609.3457, subd. 1, Psychological Services is ordered to comply with both the requirements of §609.3457 and the agreement with Minnesota State Operated Forensic Services. A copy of any Repeat Sex Offender Report produced by Psychological Services shall be forwarded to the Court and the Commissioner of Corrections.

7. In the case of competency evaluations pursuant to Minnesota Statutes § 611.43 and Rule 20.01, the Examiner shall offer in the report an opinion and support for the opinion on:
  - a. Defendant's mental health and cognition, including any diagnoses made and the results of any testing conducted with the defendant;
  - b. Defendant's competency to stand trial;
  - c. Level of care and education required for the defendant to attain, be restored to, or maintain competency;
  - d. A recommendation of the least restrictive setting appropriate to meet the defendant's needs for attaining competency and immediate safety;
  - e. Impact of any substance use disorder on the defendant, including the defendant's competency, and any recommendations for treatment;
  - f. Likelihood the defendant will attain competency in the reasonably foreseeable future;
  - g. Whether the defendant poses a substantial likelihood of physical harm to self or others;
  - h. Whether the defendant, if opined incompetent to proceed by the court examiner, possesses capacity to make decisions regarding neuroleptic medication;
  - i. Whether the defendant is suitable to refer for consideration of civil commitment and the basis of the possible commitment;
  - j. Whether the defendant may be mentally ill and dangerous; and
  - k. Whether the defendant needs immediate hospitalization.
  
8. In the case of competency evaluations pursuant to Minnesota Statutes § 611.43 and Rule 20.01, the Examiner shall promptly notify the Court, prosecutor, defense attorney and those responsible for the care and custody of the defendant if the Examiner concludes the defendant:
  - a. Presents an imminent risk of serious danger to another,
  - b. May be imminently suicidal, or
  - c. Needs emergency intervention.

Dated: April 29, 2025



Sarah Hudleston  
District Court Judge

- ✓ Please direct the prosecuting agency to forward a copy of the police report for each case to Psychological Services.

**TO BE USED WITH ALL COMPETENCY/RULE 20.01 EVALUATIONS**

Filed in District Court

State of Minnesota

04/29/2025

District Court

State of Minnesota  
Hennepin County

Fourth Judicial District

State of Minnesota,  
Plaintiff,

v.

**Order for Appointment of Forensic  
Navigator**MATTHEW DAVID GUERTIN  
4385 Trenton Lane N UNIT 202  
Plymouth MN 55442,  
Defendant.

27-CR-23-1886

Defendant Information	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Out of Custody	<input type="checkbox"/> In Custody – at Facility: _____
Date of Birth: 07/17/1981	SILS Identifier: 403932
Phone:	Home: 763-221-4540, Cell: 763-221-4540
Email:	mattguertin@protonmail.com
Current Address:	4385 Trenton Lane N UNIT 202 Plymouth MN 55442
<input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed address with Defendant	
Additional family/collateral contact number and instructions:	

It is hereby ordered:

1. A forensic navigator is appointed under Minn. Stat. § 611.42, subd. 3(b), if one is available and assigned by the Forensic Navigator Program. The Forensic Navigator Program shall inform the court of any such assignment by filing a Notice of Assignment in this case. Once assigned, the forensic navigator is ordered to provide the services described in Minn. Stat. § 611.55, including: developing a bridge plan to identify appropriate housing and services; assisting and supervising defendants when appointed to do so by the court; providing services to assist defendants with mental illnesses and cognitive impairments; and, if ordered to supervise a defendant, reporting to the court on defendant's compliance or noncompliance with conditions of pretrial supervision and any order of the court.
2. By presentation of a copy of this Order by the forensic navigator assigned by the Forensic Navigator Program, whether mailed, sent electronically, or personally delivered, any agency or department shall release within 96 hours all information and/or records of the defendant including medical, psychological, behavioral, chemical dependency, social service, probation/correctional/jail records (including behavioral notes, medical notes, psychiatric notes, jail reports or logs, and any records or information maintained by a jail from any third party medical provider/contractor/public health staff), developmental disability, military, Social Security, employment, and educational records to the forensic navigator assigned by the Forensic Navigator Program by the custodian of the records for the purpose of the examination, notwithstanding the Minnesota Health Records Act, the Minnesota Government Data Practices Act, the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act, or any other federal or state law. Such information and/or records may be delivered to the forensic navigator assigned by the Forensic Navigator Program by mail, sent electronically, discussed verbally, or personally delivered. These records will not be included in the court file. Any further use or disclosure of these records shall only be by court order.

**TO BE USED WITH ALL COMPETENCY/RULE 20.01 EVALUATIONS**

- a. **The Court specifically finds** good cause exists for authorizing the disclosure of the identified records, including chemical dependency records, because other ways of obtaining the information are not available or would not be effective, and the public interest and need for disclosure outweighs the potential injury to the patient, the physician/patient relationship and any chemical dependency treatment facility or organization holding records pertaining to Defendant.

The Court hereby attests pursuant to HIPAA Privacy Rule at 45 CFR 164.502(a)(5)(iii), the purpose of the use or disclosure of the requested protected health information is **not** to investigate or impose liability on any person for the mere act of seeking, obtaining, providing, or facilitating reproductive health care or to identify any person for such purposes. If a person knowingly and in violation of HIPAA obtains individually identifiable health information relating to an individual or discloses individually identifiable health information to another person, that person may be subject to criminal penalties pursuant to [42 U.S.C. 1320d-6](#).

April 29, 2025  
Dated

Sarah Hudelson

District Court Judge

MINNESOTA  
JUDICIAL  
BRANCH

1 STATE OF MINNESOTA

DISTRICT COURT

2 COUNTY OF HENNEPIN

FOURTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT

3

---

4 State of Minnesota,

5 Plaintiff,

Transcript of Proceedings

6 vs.

Court File No. 27-CR-23-1886

7 Matthew David Guertin,

8 Defendant.

9

---

10

11 The above-entitled matter came before the

12 Honorable Sarah Hudleston, one of the Judges of the above-named

13 court, in Courtroom 1057, Hennepin County Government Center, 300

14 South Sixth Street, Minneapolis, Minnesota, on the 29th day of

15 April, 2025, at 11:18 a.m.

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Add. 6

## 1 A P P E A R A N C E S

2 Mawerdi Hamid and Timothy Humphreys, Assistant  
3 Hennepin County Attorneys, appeared as counsel for and on  
4 behalf of the Plaintiff.

5 Emmett Donnelly and Raissa Carpenter, Assistant  
6 Hennepin County Public Defenders, appeared as counsel for and  
7 with the Defendant.

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Maya Funk  
Official Court Reporter  
Minneapolis, Minnesota

Add. 7

## 1 P R O C E E D I N G S

2 THE CLERK: Your Honor, this is the State of  
3 Minnesota vs. Matthew Guertin, Court File 27-CR-23-1886,  
4 and we are on the record.

5 THE COURT: Good morning, Mr. Guertin.

6 MR. GUERTIN: Good morning.

7 THE COURT: Good morning, counsel. Please note  
8 appearances.

9 MS. HAMID: Good morning. Mawerdi Hamid for  
10 the state with co-counsel Timothy Humphreys, Your Honor.

11 MR. DONNELLY: Your Honor, Emmett Donnelly and  
12 Raissa Carpenter. At this point we have been appointed  
13 counsel for Mr. Guertin, and he is seated between us and  
14 present.

15 THE COURT: Okay. Last time we were together,  
16 Mr. Guertin expressed an interest in representing  
17 himself, and I gave him the petition to self-represent,  
18 and we talked about filling it out with a supervisor from  
19 the public defender's office. At that time, I explained  
20 to Mr. Guertin I couldn't take a waiver of counsel from  
21 someone who was not competent but that I was bound by  
22 Judge Koch's competency order.

23 The concern, however, happened that I am only  
24 able to follow that competency order unless and until I  
25 see evidence of lack of competency. And once I see that,

1 by law I'm required to address that, Mr. Guertin. That's  
2 the duty that the law imposes on me. I cannot take a  
3 waiver of counsel from someone who I do not believe is  
4 competent in the legal sense, in the sense of being able  
5 to rationally consult and rationally provide counsel with  
6 information and participate in his own defense.

7 You are an extremely intelligent person. You  
8 have patented really amazing technology. You've patented  
9 valuable technology. You've used AI to write really  
10 detailed legal memoranda. You have technological  
11 capabilities that probably surpass 99.9 percent of the  
12 population. So, I am not doubting your intelligence in  
13 any way whatsoever.

14 I also understand probably that nothing I say  
15 to you is probably going to see reasonable or fair  
16 because I know where you stand. I know what you think.  
17 You think the system is conspiring against you. All I  
18 can tell you is I am not. I am doing my duty under the  
19 law to make sure that somebody who's being charged with  
20 criminal charges has the ability to rationally consult  
21 and present a rational defense.

22 And based on what I've seen in the record, --  
23 and I reviewed your 50-plus page motion to dismiss, and  
24 I've looked at a number of the cites and exhibits -- I  
25 can't let you go forward because I have significant

1 concerns. And Minnesota Statute 611.42 subd. 2 says, "A  
2 defendant must not be allowed to waive counsel if the  
3 defendant lacks the ability to --" and then as pertinent  
4 here, "-- to appreciate the consequences of proceeding  
5 without counsel." And six, "comprehend other matters  
6 essential to understanding the case."

7 And the big concerns here are you're raising as  
8 defenses things related to your patent and a big  
9 conspiracy with Netflix and the government and the  
10 court -- criminal court case somehow being related to  
11 that. That we're trying to silence you. And that is not  
12 rational. That would not provide a defense to the  
13 charges. You would not have any defense to criminal  
14 liability based on the patent theories you are stating.

15 And so, therefore, I am going to order another  
16 Rule 20.01 evaluation. I know you will be extremely  
17 disappointed by this. I just can tell you that it's my  
18 duty. I have to do this. And I believe the state wanted  
19 to make a record as well.

20 MR. GUERTIN: Am I allowed to speak at some  
21 point?

22 THE COURT: In a moment. Yeah. Well, your  
23 counsel can speak for you, and then -- but first the  
24 state.

25 MS. HAMID: Thank you, Your Honor. The state

1 is also concerned with the number of filings that were  
2 filed since yesterday. It appears there were about 50  
3 filings last night, about 60 filings yesterday, and  
4 about -- over 6,000 pages of documents that were filed,  
5 and that there is a serious concern and that a Rule 20  
6 should be ordered, Your Honor.

7 THE COURT: Okay. And then I know defense  
8 counsel -- I understand, Mr. Guertin, that you're wishing  
9 to discharge them. But for now, they are still your  
10 attorneys.

11 And I know last hearing, Mr. Donnelly, you told  
12 me defense counsel does not -- did not agree with Judge  
13 Koch's order and therefore disagreed with the competency  
14 finding, correct?

15 MR. DONNELLY: That's true, Your Honor. I  
16 mean, we don't control that finding and we'll proceed  
17 accordingly. I have nothing to add to what the Court  
18 does. I mean, we're not mouthpieces, and I know Mr.  
19 Guertin objects, and I certainly am not going to be the  
20 one to put the gag over his mouth --

21 THE COURT: Sure.

22 MR. DONNELLY: -- and keep him from talking.

23 THE COURT: Okay. Well, and I can hear from  
24 you in a moment, Mr. Guertin. I just wanted to state  
25 that I did review Judge Koch's order, and I think that

1 things have materially changed since that order because  
2 that order relies on Mr. Guertin saying he will listen to  
3 his public defenders, saying he will take their advice  
4 and work with them. And then as soon as I saw Mr.  
5 Guertin, he wanted to discharge them despite them saying  
6 that they could not as officers of the court sign on to  
7 his motion to dismiss and the theories therein. So, I  
8 think things have certainly -- that the basis for that  
9 order is no longer accurate.

10 Also I have now seen new evidence of  
11 incompetence. Again, just as far as the law considers  
12 it. You're very smart, Mr. Guertin. I'm not taking  
13 anything away from your intellect and your inventions.  
14 I'm just doing what needs to be done for criminal cases.

15 So, I can see you're very eager to speak, and I  
16 will let you speak in a moment. I just want to make a  
17 really fulsome record about that we have three separate  
18 examiners opining a lack of competence under Rule 20.01.  
19 You've got two very skilled and zealous defense  
20 advocates, and they wanted to advise you, and you did not  
21 want to have them on your case any longer as soon as we  
22 got to court after the Rule 20 calendar.

23 The allegations in the criminal complaint note  
24 things that suggest paranoia, post-Miranda statements of  
25 shooting to bring the police to your home because people

1       were going to kill you over a patent. You also noted  
2       that in your own motion to dismiss at page 33.  
3       Scrolling, "They're going to kill me," I believe.

4                  There are now filings in the public record in  
5       this criminal case that evidence paranoia and conspiracy  
6       theories that are the hallmark of certain mental  
7       illnesses that the examiners have opined and that they're  
8       trained in. The expressions in the motion to dismiss,  
9       again, over 50 pages, have repeated assertions over and  
10      over and over and over again citing coordinated  
11      campaigns, intentional manipulation of the system to  
12      paint you as incompetent to proceed in your criminal case  
13      with the motive, I think, apparently being to cover up  
14      patent theft.

15                 There are highly illogical assertions in there.  
16       There's extreme language, extreme repetition, paranoia,  
17       and conspiracy assertions. Talking about -- you talk  
18       about your handwritten note that says that "Whoever is  
19       behind this has one million different ways to set me up  
20       or frame me if they want. Netflix found out about my  
21       patent way before I found out about theirs. That's for  
22       sure. They're going to kill me." Things like that.

23                 So, I know, Mr. Guertin, that you're going to  
24       think I'm part of this coordinated campaign. All I can  
25       tell you is I promise you I am not. I'm following my

1       duty. I can't let you self-represent under these  
2       circumstances.

3                   Certainly, if you, you know, have patent  
4       disputes, you can take that up with the PTO. You can  
5       take it up with a qualified patent attorney. We don't  
6       have any jurisdiction over patents here. We're all not  
7       qualified to adjudicate patents and prior art and, you  
8       know, anything like that. So, that needs to be a  
9       separate proceeding. Even tort claims that just -- that  
10      can't be part of the criminal case.

11                  We have nothing -- again, nothing to do with  
12      the patents. We have nothing to do with Netflix or other  
13      government -- federal government agencies that it sounds  
14      like you have been in dealings with.

15                  And Ms. Hamid, I can turn to you as an officer  
16      of the court with a sworn duty of candor to the court,  
17      have you had any conversations in this case with anyone  
18      from Netflix?

19                  MS. HAMID: No, Your Honor.

20                  THE COURT: Any conversations with anyone from  
21      federal government agencies?

22                  MS. HAMID: No, Your Honor.

23                  THE COURT: Okay. Also with regard to Mr.  
24      Guertin's assertions about doctored manipulated initial  
25      discovery, do you know -- can you speak to that?

10

1 MS. HAMID: No, Your Honor. The state is not  
2 aware of any of that information.

3 THE COURT: Okay. Do you know what I'm  
4 referring to when he said some initial images were  
5 mathematically incorrect and altered, and then when  
6 compared to later discovery they were inconsistent?

7 MS. HAMID: Yes, Your Honor. It was part of  
8 the competency hearing, and it was briefly discussed  
9 during that hearing. But the state is not aware of any  
10 manipulation of the evidence, Your Honor.

11 THE COURT: Okay. Okay. So, Mr. Guertin,  
12 thank you for being patient. I know this has got to feel  
13 frustrating for you. Please go ahead.

14 MR. GUERTIN: I would just like to say that my  
15 claims about a conspiracy obviously originate in matters  
16 related and pertaining to my patent, but insofar as my  
17 claims within the court, they do not -- I'm not saying  
18 anything about Netflix. I'm saying about things that  
19 indicate that it has spilled over into the court.

20 Pertaining to the issue of fraudulent discovery, it's a  
21 logical and inescapable catch-22 that currently exists.  
22 I can explain it if you'd like.

23 THE COURT: I did read your motion to dismiss,  
24 and I know you describe the catch-22 and that you had a  
25 logical I guess victory. I don't want to do that now

11

1 because my decision is made, and I have more than ample  
2 basis for it. If you want to say a little something  
3 about it, you're welcome to.

4 MR. GUERTIN: Well, I would just say that it  
5 wouldn't matter even if it wasn't in the Hennepin County  
6 OneDrive system because once the photos existed and then  
7 they squished them to put them into the uniform aspect  
8 ratio, they can't un-squish them. So, it's a logical  
9 trap that proves my claim about it that can't be escaped.  
10 So, it's now being ignored because I'm being sidelined  
11 again by being determined incompetent.

12 And insofar as my filings that I filed  
13 yesterday, I don't know how many thousands of pages are  
14 the court's own records of completely AI-generated  
15 fraudulent cases that I uncovered which is now submitted  
16 into the record.

17 So, you -- that's hard evidence of 163 cases  
18 that I collected exactly one year ago around April 26th  
19 by filtering the three judges that were controlling my  
20 case and searching for their hearing dates on the MCRO  
21 system and then using a Python script to filter thousands  
22 of cases down to the 163 cases that they all had a part  
23 in spanning January 1st, 2023, to April 26th of 2024.

24 And with that 163 cases, I then used an  
25 automated script one morning to download 3,553 MCRO files

Add. 16

12

1 all in order for all those cases, and I ended up with a  
2 data set that had my name in it because those judges were  
3 controlling my case. Those judges are Judge Julia Dayton  
4 Klein, Referee Borer, and Referee Mercurio. And then  
5 that was based on curiosity. Is this normal procedure  
6 because it seemed like they were controlling my case to a  
7 non-standard like strange degree let's say, right?

8 So, the data set that I ended up with is  
9 thousands of files, and it contains AI-generated USPS  
10 mail filings. That's irrefutable. And it contains the  
11 same exact mirrored orders over and over and over, and it  
12 also contains Raissa Carpenter assigned to 16 completely  
13 fake cases such as Lucas Kraskey. What is there? 27-CR-  
14 21-8067, 27-CR-21-8227, 27-CR-21-8228, 27-CR-21-8229, 27-  
15 CR-21-8230, 27-CR-21-8511, 27-CR-21-20637, 27-CR-22-  
16 17300, 27-CR --

17 THE COURT: Okay. So, Mr. Guertin, I'm going  
18 to stop you here because I know you filed this.

19 MR. GUERTIN: These are --

20 THE COURT: So, it is in writing in your  
21 motion.

22 MR. GUERTIN: And if you'd --

23 THE COURT: Sir, --

24 MR. GUERTIN: I could hand it in. I have a map  
25 for what I handed in that relates to the indexes and maps

13

1 them across since there was so many of them.

2 THE COURT: Sure. I will take that today. I'm  
3 focused today on your criminal charges and very  
4 specifically if I can accept your request to self-  
5 represent, and I simply cannot. Under the law -- the  
6 statute I read you as well as Rule 20.01, my duty is to  
7 order another evaluation. Again, I know you're going to  
8 think that I'm somehow part of a conspiracy. I'm sorry  
9 that you think that.

10 I -- as a very intelligent person, maybe I  
11 could pose to you the question of, let's say for  
12 argument's sake you were under some mental illness or  
13 some symptoms, maybe you could agree that it would seem  
14 like everyone is against you. Would you agree with that?  
15 Just for argument's sake if you --

16 MR. GUERTIN: No. What happened was that I  
17 was -- had the -- I was going to swear. I had the crap  
18 scared out of me, and I have all the evidence now. So,  
19 all of my claims aren't based on -- the definition of  
20 "delusions" is a false version of reality despite  
21 evidence to the contrary. That's not what I'm -- I'm not  
22 suffering from delusions because I have all the evidence.

23 THE COURT: Okay. So, the delusional part,  
24 I'll set that aside. For me, my focus is that I can't  
25 find that you can rationally defend yourself and

14

1 rationally participate with defense counsel as you told  
2 Judge Koch that you would when he ordered the competency  
3 finding. So, I do need to do another one. So, I'm going  
4 to order that now. That will be done on an out of  
5 custody basis.

6 And with regard to, you know, your concerns  
7 about Hennepin County documentation systems, I really  
8 can't speak to any of that. You know, that's something  
9 maybe that you can think about addressing if appropriate  
10 with --

11 MR. GUERTIN: It's in the record.

12 THE COURT: Right. But I'm saying it's not  
13 part of -- that doesn't have relevance to your criminal  
14 case.

15 MR. GUERTIN: It has relevance to the  
16 legitimacy of the entire court.

17 THE COURT: Okay. But that's what I'm saying  
18 is this is not the conspiracy of the court system. We  
19 don't have anything to do with the people who stole your  
20 patents or who are using your technology perhaps without  
21 remunerating you as they're supposed to. We don't have  
22 anything to do with that. And certainly, you can hire a  
23 patent lawyer and you can go after that. But that's not  
24 the place here. So, we'll order the Rule 20.01 now.

25 MR. DONNELLY: Judge, may I just clarify one

Add. 19

1 thing I said earlier?

2 THE COURT: Yeah.

3 MR. DONNELLY: That is that I don't criticize  
4 Judge Koch's ruling. He dealt with the snapshot that he  
5 had in front of him, and competency isn't static.

6 THE COURT: Of course. And I wasn't -- I'm not  
7 criticizing it either. I'm saying there have been  
8 material changes since that hearing based on what I read  
9 in his order and what he had --

10 MR. DONNELLY: Yeah. I understand that too. I  
11 just wanted to be clear I'm not.

12 THE COURT: Thank you. And I didn't -- nope.  
13 I didn't take it that way whatsoever, and I'm not either.  
14 Of course. Things are --

15 MR. GUERTIN: Is there an official objection to  
16 this being noted in the record?

17 THE COURT: Certainly your objection is noted,  
18 sir. Absolutely. Yes.

19 (Dates were discussed.)

20 MR. GUERTIN: What are we scheduling? A return  
21 to --

22 MS. CARPENTER: So, they're ordering you to  
23 meet with a Rule 20 evaluator. And so, then they pick a  
24 period of time for the Rule 20 evaluator to meet with you  
25 and to write a new report for the Court. So, July 8th

16

1 you're scheduled to appear on the Rule 20 calendar which  
2 is with all the mental health probate judges. They run  
3 that calendar. And by then there will be a report. On  
4 that date you either object to the report or you agree  
5 with the report, and then they can enter a finding based  
6 on the report and then set a hearing. If you're found --

7 MR. GUERTIN: And what's being scheduled is a  
8 Rule 20 or coming back in front of --

9 MS. CARPENTER: Yep. A Rule 20 and then you'd  
10 go on the Rule 20 calendar on the 8th. If you're found  
11 competent on the 8th, then you need a court date with  
12 Judge Hudleston to restart your case and restart  
13 proceedings. So, they're picking a second date after  
14 July 8th that theoretically your case can restart if  
15 you're found competent on July 8th.

16 (Dates were discussed.)

17 THE CLERK: I'll get you some notices, Mr.  
18 Guertin.

19 THE COURT: And you can note, Porshia, in the  
20 referral that Mr. Guertin objects to being re-referred.

21 THE CLERK: Okay.

22 MR. GUERTIN: Did you have a chance to look at  
23 the affidavit?

24 THE COURT: I did not have a chance to look at  
25 anything you filed yesterday. I was on a court calendar

Add. 21

17

1 until 7 p.m., and there are hundreds and hundreds of  
2 pages. But I looked at a lot of the things you filed --

3 MR. GUERTIN: Yeah, the --

4 THE COURT: -- with related to the motion to  
5 dismiss.

6 MR. GUERTIN: And that's what you're basing the  
7 incompetency on?

8 THE COURT: Oh. I looked at the competency  
9 evaluation. I've looked at Judge Koch's order. And --

10 MR. GUERTIN: So, it's based on not even  
11 looking at the filings yesterday?

12 THE COURT: It's based on what I saw that you  
13 filed in your motion to dismiss that I had not had a  
14 chance to review when I saw you last. It's based on that  
15 as well as looking back into your file and then looking  
16 at some of the things you cited in your motion to  
17 dismiss. Correct. And I did --

18 MS. HAMID: Your Honor, --

19 THE COURT: Sorry. I did look at as quickly as  
20 I could this morning at the general nature of your  
21 filings yesterday, but I certainly couldn't read  
22 thousands of pages or hundreds of pages.

23 MR. GUERTIN: Yeah. They're not all to be read  
24 necessarily.

25 THE COURT: Yeah. Right. I saw the general

Add. 22

1 nature of them. Yes.

2 MS. HAMID: Your Honor, may I? Last time there  
3 was lack of cooperation from Mr. Guertin to meet with an  
4 evaluator. And instead he sent emails to the evaluator.  
5 Can we just put on the record that he's required to meet  
6 with the evaluator in person?

7 THE COURT: Yes. Mr. Guertin, I know you  
8 object to this. I will note your strenuous objection.  
9 It's very well documented in your filings. You do need  
10 to meet with them in person.

11 MS. CARPENTER: I don't know if they always  
12 want to meet in person.

13 THE COURT: Or by Zoom.

14 MS. HAMID: Or by Zoom. Yeah.

15 THE COURT: You need to meet with them so that  
16 they can have a conversation with you whether virtually  
17 or in person.

18 THE CLERK: And Mr. Guertin, does your phone  
19 number still end in 4540?

20 MR. GUERTIN: Correct.

21 THE CLERK: Okay.

22 MR. DONNELLY: May I approach, Your Honor? Do  
23 you want this document?

24 MS. CARPENTER: You said you would --

25 THE COURT: Yes. I'll take that. Thank you.

19

1 Thank you, counsel. Take care.

2 Take care, Mr. Guertin.

3 MR. GUERTIN: Thank you.

4 (The proceedings were adjourned at 11:40 a.m.)

10  
11  
12  
13 MINNESOTA  
14 JUDICIAL  
15 BRANCH

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

Add. 24

20

1 STATE OF MINNESOTA)  
2 ss:  
COUNTY OF HENNEPIN)

3

4

COURT REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

5

I, MAYA FUNK, an Official Court Reporter in and  
for the Fourth Judicial District of the State of  
Minnesota, do hereby certify that I have transcribed  
the foregoing transcript from the CourtSmart audio  
recording, and that the foregoing pages constitute a  
true and correct transcript of the proceedings taken in  
connection with the above-entitled matter to the best  
of my ability.

Dated: May 3, 2025

15

16

/s/ *Maya Funk*

Maya Funk  
Official Court Reporter  
C859 Government Center  
300 South Sixth Street  
Minneapolis, MN 55487  
(612) 322-6951

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Add. 25

State of Minnesota  
County of Hennepin

District Court  
4th Judicial District

Prosecutor File No.  
Court File No.

23A00785  
27-CR-23-1886

---

State of Minnesota,

**COMPLAINT**

Plaintiff,

Order of Detention

vs.

**MATTHEW DAVID GUERTIN DOB: 07/17/1981**

10233 34th St W  
#304  
Minnetonka, MN 55305

Defendant.

---

The Complainant submits this complaint to the Court and states that there is probable cause to believe Defendant committed the following offense(s):

**COUNT I**

**Charge: Dangerous Weapons-Reckless Discharge of Firearm Within a Municipality**

Minnesota Statute: 609.66.1a(a)(3), with reference to: 609.66.1a(b)(2)

Maximum Sentence: 2 YEARS AND/OR \$5,000

Offense Level: Felony

Offense Date (on or about): 01/21/2023

Control #(ICR#): 23000258

Charge Description: That on or about January 21, 2023, in Hennepin County, Minnesota, MATTHEW DAVID GUERTIN recklessly discharged a firearm within a municipality.

**COUNT II**

**Charge: Firearm-Serial Number-Receive/Possess With No Serial Number**

Minnesota Statute: 609.667(3), with reference to: 609.667

Maximum Sentence: 5 YEARS AND/OR \$10,000

Offense Level: Felony

Offense Date (on or about): 01/21/2023

Control #(ICR#): 23000258

Charge Description: That on or about January 21, 2023, in Hennepin County, Minnesota, MATTHEW DAVID GUERTIN received or possessed a firearm that was not identified by a serial number: an automatic rifle.

**COUNT III**

**Charge: Firearm-Serial Number-Receive/Possess With No Serial Number**

Minnesota Statute: 609.667(3), with reference to: 609.667

Offense Date (on or about): 01/21/2023

Control #(ICR#): 23000258

Charge Description: That on or about January 21, 2023, in Hennepin County, Minnesota, MATTHEW DAVID GUERTIN received or possessed a firearm that was not identified by a serial number: a full-size pistol.

#### COUNT IV

##### **Charge: Firearm-Serial Number-Receive/Possess With No Serial Number**

Minnesota Statute: 609.667(3), with reference to: 609.667

Maximum Sentence: 5 YEARS AND/OR \$10,000

Offense Level: Felony

Offense Date (on or about): 01/21/2023

Control #(ICR#): 23000258

Charge Description: That on or about January 21, 2023, in Hennepin County, Minnesota, MATTHEW DAVID GUERTIN received or possessed a firearm that was not identified by a serial number: a compact pistol.

MINNESOTA  
JUDICIAL  
BRANCH

Complainant has investigated the facts and circumstances of this offense and believes the following establishes probable cause:

On January 21, 2023, officers with the Minnetonka Police Department were dispatched to a report of shots being fired from an apartment at 102XX 34th St. W., Minnetonka, Hennepin County, Minnesota.

Upon arriving in the area officers heard shots and were able to confirm where the apartment shots were coming from, and that the occupant of the apartment was MATTHEW DAVID GUERTIN, dob 7/17/1981, "Defendant" herein. Defendant was yelling "I'm going to die because they stole my patent" and repeatedly yelled a Minnetonka Police Department case number. Defendant spoke with a negotiator and after some time threw two firearms out of the window: an automatic rifle and a pistol in a case. Defendant eventually came out of the apartment and was placed under arrest. In a post-Miranda statement Defendant reported that he had fired multiple rounds to get the police to respond to his location, and that he had shot into the sky and trees. Defendant estimated he had fired approximately twenty rounds. Defendant said that he could not communicate via his computer or phone because other people had gained control of his computer and other devices. Defendant also said that he had bought the parts and put together the firearms that he had used.

Officers recovered three firearms from the incident: an automatic rifle, a full-size pistol, and a compact pistol. None of the firearms had serial numbers on them. Officers also recovered additional ammunition and body armor inside Defendant's apartment.

Defendant is currently in custody.

MINNESOTA  
JUDICIAL  
BRANCH

Complainant requests that Defendant, subject to bail or conditions of release, be:  
(1) arrested or that other lawful steps be taken to obtain Defendant's appearance in court; or  
(2) detained, if already in custody, pending further proceedings; and that said Defendant otherwise be dealt with according to law.

Complainant declares under penalty of perjury that everything stated in this document is true and correct. Minn. Stat. § 358.116; Minn. R. Crim. P. 2.01, subds. 1, 2.

<b>Complainant</b>	Samantha Johnson Police Officer 14600 Minnetonka Boulevard Minnetonka, MN 55345 Badge: 133	Electronically Signed: 01/24/2023 10:49 AM Hennepin County, MN
--------------------	--	--

Being authorized to prosecute the offenses charged, I approve this complaint.

<b>Prosecuting Attorney</b>	Erin Goltz 300 S 6th St Minneapolis, MN 55487 (612) 348-5550	Electronically Signed: 01/24/2023 10:23 AM
-----------------------------	---	---

From the above sworn facts, and any supporting affidavits or supplemental sworn testimony, I, the Issuing Officer, have determined that probable cause exists to support, subject to bail or conditions of release where applicable, Defendant's arrest or other lawful steps be taken to obtain Defendant's appearance in court, or Defendant's detention, if already in custody, pending further proceedings. Defendant is therefore charged with the above-stated offense(s).

**SUMMONS**

THEREFORE YOU, THE DEFENDANT, ARE SUMMONED to appear as directed in the Notice of Hearing before the above-named court to answer this complaint.

IF YOU FAIL TO APPEAR in response to this SUMMONS, a WARRANT FOR YOUR ARREST shall be issued.

**WARRANT**

To the Sheriff of the above-named county; or other person authorized to execute this warrant: I order, in the name of the State of Minnesota, that the Defendant be apprehended and arrested without delay and brought promptly before the court (if in session), and if not, before a Judge or Judicial Officer of such court without unnecessary delay, and in any event not later than 36 hours after the arrest or as soon as such Judge or Judicial Officer is available to be dealt with according to law.

*Execute in MN Only*

*Execute Nationwide*

*Execute in Border States*

**ORDER OF DETENTION**

Since the Defendant is already in custody, I order, subject to bail or conditions of release, that the Defendant continue to be detained pending further proceedings.

Bail: \$50,000.00

Conditions of Release: No use of drugs/alcohol; Make All Appearances; Remain Law Abiding; No Possession of Weapons

This complaint, duly subscribed and sworn to or signed under penalty of perjury, is issued by the undersigned Judicial Officer as of the following date: January 24, 2023.

Judicial Officer

Edward Thomas Wahl  
District Court Judge

Electronically Signed: 01/24/2023 11:40 AM

Sworn testimony has been given before the Judicial Officer by the following witnesses:

COUNTY OF HENNEPIN  
STATE OF MINNESOTA

**State of Minnesota**

Plaintiff

vs.

**MATTHEW DAVID GUERTIN**

Defendant

**LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICER RETURN OF SERVICE**  
*I hereby Certify and Return that I have served a copy of this Order of Detention upon the Defendant herein named.*

Signature of Authorized Service Agent:

**Name:** MATTHEW DAVID GUERTIN  
**DOB:** 07/17/1981  
**Address:** 10233 34th St W  
#304  
Minnetonka, MN 55305

**Alias Names/DOB:**

**SID:** MN00417780

**Height:**

**Weight:**

**Eye Color:**

**Hair Color:**

**Gender:** MALE

**Race:** White

**Fingerprints Required per Statute:** Yes

**Fingerprint match to Criminal History Record:** Yes

**Driver's License #:**

**SILS Person ID #:** 403932

**SILS Tracking No.** 3316315

**Alcohol Concentration:**

MINNESOTA  
JUDICIAL  
BRANCH

Cnt Nbr	Statute Type	Offense Date(s)	Statute Nbrs and Descriptions	Offense Level	MOC	GOC	Controlling Agencies	Case Numbers
1	Charge	1/21/2023	609.66.1a(a)(3) Dangerous Weapons-Reckless Discharge of Firearm Within a Municipality	Felony	W1E40	MN0271200	23000258	
	Penalty	1/21/2023	609.66.1a(b)(2) Dangerous Weapons-Other Offenses	Felony	W1E40			
2	Charge	1/21/2023	609.667(3) Firearm-Serial Number-Receive/Possess With No Serial Number	Felony	W1840	MN0271200	23000258	
	Penalty	1/21/2023	609.667 Firearms-Removal or Alteration of Serial Number	Felony	W1840			
3	Charge	1/21/2023	609.667(3) Firearm-Serial Number-Receive/Possess With No Serial Number	Felony	W1840	MN0271200	23000258	
	Penalty	1/21/2023	609.667 Firearms-Removal or Alteration of Serial Number	Felony	W1840			
4	Charge	1/21/2023	609.667(3) Firearm-Serial Number-Receive/Possess With No Serial Number	Felony	W1840	MN0271200	23000258	
	Penalty	1/21/2023	609.667 Firearms-Removal or Alteration of Serial Number	Felony	W1840			

MINNESOTA  
JUDICIAL  
BRANCH